



OPEN

## Author Correction: Centrifugation does not remove bacteria from the fat fraction of human milk

Lisa F. Stinson, Jie Ma, Alethea Rea, Michael Dymock & Donna T. Geddes

Correction to: *Scientific Reports* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-79793-y>, published online 12 January 2021

The original version of this Article contained errors, where P-values resulting from analysis of absolute abundance (number of reads) were mistakenly reported instead of P-values resulting from relative abundance analysis.

As a result, in the Abstract section,

“*Staphylococcus epidermidis* was significantly more abundant in the cell pellet compared to the fat fraction ( $P=0.038$ ), and three low-abundance species ( $<5\%$  relative abundance) were recovered from one fraction only.”

now reads:

“Two low-abundance *Staphylococcus* species ( $<0.5\%$  relative abundance) were significantly more abundant in the cell pellet compared to the fat fraction ( $P<0.04$ ), and three low-abundance species ( $<5\%$  relative abundance) were recovered from one fraction only.”

Additionally, in the Results section under the subheading ‘Bacterial DNA profiles of human milk fractions’,

“There was a high level of inter-individual variation between each mother, with no overall differences between the cell pellet and fat fractions detected (PERMANOVA  $P=0.523$ ; Shannon diversity  $P=0.928$ ). The low fat pre-feed samples ( $3.5\pm1.9\%$  fat) and high fat post-feed samples ( $9.5\pm3.6\%$  fat) did not differ upon PERMANOVA analysis ( $P=0.563$ ) nor Shannon diversity analysis ( $P=0.699$ ). Univariate regression analysis revealed a single species, *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, to be significantly more abundant in the cell pellet (relative abundance  $45.9\%$ ) than in the fat fraction (relative abundance  $39.8\%$ ) ( $P=0.038$ ).”

now reads:

“There was a high level of inter-individual variation between each mother, with no overall differences between the cell pellet and fat fractions detected (PERMANOVA  $P=0.926$ ; Shannon diversity  $P=0.928$ ). The low fat pre-feed samples ( $3.5\pm1.9\%$  fat) and high fat post-feed samples ( $9.5\pm3.6\%$  fat) did not differ upon PERMANOVA analysis ( $P=0.68$ ) nor Shannon diversity analysis ( $P=0.699$ ). Univariate regression analysis revealed two low-abundance species, *Staphylococcus caprae* ( $P=0.0017$ ) and *Staphylococcus capitis* ( $P=0.033$ ), to be significantly more abundant in the cell pellet (relative abundance  $0.3\%$  and  $0.23\%$ , respectively) than in the fat fraction (relative abundance  $0.17\%$  and  $0.1\%$ , respectively).”

Furthermore, in the Discussion section,

“*S. epidermidis*, the most abundant species in these samples, was significantly more abundant in the cell pellet compared to the fat fraction.”

now reads:

“Two low-abundance *Staphylococcus* species were significantly more abundant in the cell pellet compared to the fat fraction.”

Published online: 05 May 2021

Additionally, the original version of this Article contained a typographical error in the Methods section, under the subheading ‘Bacterial DNA Profiling’.

“OTU tables were denoised to a minimum of ten reads.”

now reads:

“OTU tables were denoised to a minimum of twenty reads.”

Finally, in the original version of the Article the legend for Figure 1 was incomplete.

“Relative abundance of bacterial species detected in different fractions (fat or cell pellet) of human milk samples (n = 10). For a subset of six mothers, whole milk pre-feed (low fat) and whole milk post-feed (high fat) samples were also available.”

now reads:

“Relative abundance of bacterial species detected in different fractions (fat or cell pellet) of human milk samples (n = 10). For a subset of six mothers, whole milk pre-feed (low fat) and whole milk post-feed (high fat) samples were also available. Data presented here are raw data (i.e. not denoised).”

These errors have now been corrected in the HTML and PDF versions of the Article.



**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2021